

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Campbell/Domenici amendment No. 864, to replace "tribal consortia" with "tribal energy resource development organizations".

Dorgan amendment No. 865, to require that the hydrogen commercialization plan of the Department of Energy include a description of activities to support certain hydrogen technology deployment goals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes equally divided for debate in relationship to the Dorgan amendment No. 865.

The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 865

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is an amendment we will vote on this morning. I was disappointed yesterday to discover that there was opposition to the amendment. This is an amendment that passed without opposition in the last Congress. So surprisingly now I am discovering that some have changed their mind.

I will describe why, if this Congress has any gumption at all to decide that we ought to change course and move in a new direction and be bold and big when we think about our energy future, they will support this amendment.

President Bush said the following about our dependence on foreign oil in his State of the Union Address: America's energy security is threatened by our dependence on foreign oil. He said: We import 55 percent of the oil we consume. That is expected to grow to 68 percent by 2025. Nearly all of our cars and trucks run on gasoline. They are the main reason America imports so much oil—that, from President Bush—two-thirds of the 20 million barrels of oil we use each day for transportation.

Fuel cell vehicles offer the best hope of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. The President said that because he was proposing a new direction for America's energy supply: Hydrogen and fuel cells.

Following his State of the Union Address in which he proposed that, he had a gathering at the Building Museum in Washington, DC. He invited all of the industry leaders throughout the country to come. He gave a great speech. I was there with my colleague Senator DOMENICI. We were invited to be a part of it. He talked again about striking out in this new direction and talked

about developing hydrogen and fuel cells as part of our future. That made sense to me.

I have spoken often of the first old car I had when I was a young kid. I bought a Model T Ford and restored it as an old antique. The way you gas up this 1924 Model T Ford is you pull up to a pump, stick a hose in the tank, and pump it full of gas. And what do you do with a 2003 Ford? Exactly the same thing. Nothing has changed in almost a century. We are still running gasoline through those carburetors.

What the President says—and I agree with him—is let's decide to change that and reduce our dependence on foreign oil because that is where the growth in energy use is coming; that is, on America's roads and America's vehicles. Do we want to be at a point where we have over one-half of our oil coming from off our shores, much of it from very troubled parts of the world? Do we want to be at the point where we have 68 percent of it coming from other parts of the world, where if, God forbid, some morning we woke up and discovered terrorists had interrupted the supply of oil and this American economy would be flat on its back? Is that how what we want to be held hostage? I do not think so.

So the President says let's strike out in a new direction. He proposed \$1.2 billion on a hydrogen program. It is exactly the right thing to do. I commend him for it. But \$1.2 billion is timid; it is not enough. Nonetheless, it is moving in the right direction, and for this American President to put his administration on the line to move in that direction is not insignificant at all; it is very significant.

I have pushed and pushed, and now this Energy bill has almost tripled the amount the President recommended for a new hydrogen-based economy and fuel cell future.

I proposed \$6.5 billion over 5 years, an Apollo-type program. President Kennedy said: Let's put a man on the Moon by the end of the decade. He set a goal. And we did. I said: Let's have an Apollo program, decide we are going to move toward a hydrogen fuel cell future for our vehicles.

Do my colleagues know that a vehicle is twice as efficient using a fuel cell as it is using gasoline through a carburetor? It is double the efficiency getting power to the wheel. And what do you get out the back end of a vehicle that uses hydrogen in a fuel cell? Water vapor. You are not driving around town belching black smoke. You get water vapor. It is good for the environment, good for this country's energy security, and good for this country's economy. The fact is, this is moving in exactly the right direction. So I commend President Bush.

We also made progress in the Energy Committee, saying let's increase that which the President recommended, but it is still short of where we ought to be, No. 1. No. 2, it does not include targets and timetables. I do not suggest they

be mandatory, but I do say this: Let's decide where we are headed, and when we give the Department of Energy and others \$3 billion plus, let's say here is where we would like to go, here is our destination, here is our map. I say let's aspire to have 100,000 vehicles on the road in the year 2010 that are hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicles and 2½ million vehicles by 2020.

My colleague yesterday said, well, we think maybe it is a mandate. I said, no, it is not a mandate at all. Just ask the Department of Energy to develop a strategy that says here is what we would like to do. We cannot force that to happen, but at least a goal is established.

Japan has goals and strategies with respect to hydrogen and fuel cells. They are moving very quickly. Europe is moving very quickly. Japan wants 50,000 by 2010 and 5 million vehicles by 2020. General Motors has a goal of having 1 million vehicles by 2010—Ford, Nissan, DaimlerChrysler. The fact is, the industry is moving very quickly as well.

I just do not happen to think we ought to throw a bunch of money at Energy and say: Do what you can with it and report back. I guarantee, if \$3 billion or \$3.5 billion is put into a bureaucratic envelope and sent down to an agency and they are told to report to us when they have half a notion and tell us what they have done, we are not going to make much progress.

What I believe this Congress ought to do is say: Here is what we aspire to achieve. This is a big, bold plan, and we want to make progress. We would like by the year 2010 on the streets in this country 100,000 automobiles that are powered by hydrogen and use fuel cells. We would like 2½ million by the year 2020.

Why do I say we need some targets and timetables? Because this is not easy to do. This is not something that one company can do or one industry can do. This requires a combination of private sector investment and initiative, and it requires public policy that accommodates this conversion.

First of all, we have to deal in a whole range of areas. How do you produce hydrogen? Hydrogen is everywhere. It comes from everything. It can come from natural gas, from coal, you can take hydrogen from water. You can use a wind turbine and produce electricity from the air and use that electricity to separate oxygen and hydrogen in water, store the hydrogen, use it in a fuel cell, and double the efficiency of how you power an automobile and have water vapor coming out of the tail pipe of the automobile. How wonderful this country's future. But it will not happen unless the Congress and the President decide we are going to move to a different future.

The first antique car I bought and restored when I was a kid was 75 years old. I put gas in it the same way I put gas in a car today. It is never going to